## REMARKS

Claims 2-10 remain in the application after the above amendment.

Claim 1 had been rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being anticipated by either Haining (U.S. 5,176,650) or Daughtery (U.S. 5,462,533). Claim 1 has been cancelled.

Claims 3-5, 7 and 9 had been rejected Under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph because several terms in the claims lacked antecedent basis. The dependency of claim 3 ( and the others ultimately) has been changed to claim 2 which provides all of the antecedent basis required.

Claims 2, 6, 8 and 10 had been allowed. The remaining claims should now also be allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and early allowance of all of the remaining claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard L. Moseley

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Reg. No. 32,482

P.O. Box 630708

Houston, Texas 77263

(713)780-7047

Date 4/8/05



## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United Postal States Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on 4/8/0%.

Richard L. Moseley